

Alexander Gunyon

From: Jane [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2024 13:59
To: Consultations
Subject: Consultation for Canterbury District Local Plan to 2024

Categories: Blue category

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

From: Mr & Mrs True
[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern

With reference to the consultation for Canterbury District Local Plan to 2024.

We are writing to object to policies W3 and W4 (Brooklands Farm) and policy C12 land north of the University of Kent. Whilst we highlight these specific policies, we also have concerns about many other aspects of the plan and many of the below listed concerns apply to all or some of those other policies.

Without the luxury of the time to be able consider the entire local plan in detail or, to be able to gather evidence, our concerns are mostly based on anecdotal evidence. In many cases, there is evidence to support them and it should not be disregarded on that basis.

Local groups such as Save Brooklands Farm and Save the Blean have gathered information and evidence in support of objections and we refer to and support them in their cause.

As long standing residents of Whitstable and, both having been born and raised in Kent, we feel strongly about preserving it's unique, irreplaceable, rich and varied environments, landscapes and communities.

The region is already heavily populated and is also impacted heavily by bearing the brunt of refugees arriving in the area and London boroughs placing some of their, often highly dependent residents in Kent.

Whilst we acknowledge that there is some need to address issues such as more provision in terms of affordable housing, schools, transport and community services, this should be addressed in terms of current needs with the existing level of population as they are already lacking. Significantly increasing the local population with such extensive new housing will only exacerbate this.

Local infrastructure is already inadequate in many instances. All health and public services are already under pressure and it is very unlikely their resources will increase proportionately with an increased population.

It is also not an area that offers significant employment opportunities.

The reasoning being given that central government targets have to met is not a justifiable reason to progress to the detriment of the area, environment and communities. The problem with setting targets is that the focus becomes meeting the targets and not what is in the best interest of the area and community.

The issue of “affordable” housing is, at least in part, an economic issue not necessarily an issue of not enough housing. If people can’t afford houses then address and sort out the economics causing that.

Below is a list of some of our concerns (in no particular order):-

- increased risk of flooding: it is known that there is already an issue with flooding in this area. Land is largely clay. It is known that residents of the new Whitstable Heights housing development have some significant issues with their houses and gardens and frankly, the development has created such a cramped in environment it does not create a pleasant place to live.

Despite developers stating they will address drainage issues, the water still has to be sent and end up somewhere so it only serves to move the problem elsewhere. Where will that be? Which residents will then be affected by it?

- health services are already overstretched and GPs, nursing and other health professionals are struggling to recruit and retain staff as it is, partly because of the unreasonable expectations on them and the impact on them as individuals.

- other public services e.g. schools/education, social care, Police, Fire and Rescue are already overstretched and unlikely to increase in resources so a larger population will only add to their pressures and the difficulties for residents in getting the support and services they need.

- water supplies - this region (south east) has been increasingly affected by water shortages/drought in recent years and inevitably has water restrictions imposed for the summer period and sometimes beyond. Increased population will put greater demand on the water supply.

Continuing climate change is likely to exacerbate this and in turn, the destruction of green space and biodiversity will negatively contribute to climate change.

- increased traffic - local roads are already in a poor state and congested. Proposals for more slip roads will only channel more traffic in to neighbourhoods whose lives will be blighted by more pollution and increased noise and disruption as a result. Parking in the area is also limited.

- it is well publicised that the sewerage system cannot cope with existing demand resulting in the regular and unacceptable pollution of local open water.

- loss of agricultural land - Kent is known as “the garden of England” and has a history of growing a wide variety of produce. With the current global situation of increasing food insecurity, we are foolish to become more and more dependant on other countries to provide us with food and supplies. We have to become more self sufficient and this surely should put Kent and this area in a strong position to do so. This would also bring more employment and growth (literally!) to the area.

- the loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity is completely counterproductive in terms of any efforts to help to reduce the impact of climate change.

Again, this area is rich in green space, ancient woodland and other biodiverse and heritage sites.

Wildlife does not understand that it will need to relocate when the diggers move in and it and other natural species will be destroyed. Wildlife will become more concentrated in smaller areas meaning their ability to survive and thrive in the future is at greater risk. Reduction of “green corridors” for wildlife increases the risk to their future existence.

These areas should be protected not destroyed. A significant part of why people choose to live and enjoy living here is because of the

beauty and benefit of these things allowing many different aspects of enjoyment to people.

Any promise by developers to “create” contrived “green”/recreational spaces simply doesn’t compensate for what would be lost (forever).

- refuse and landfill - will the council and environment be able to cope with increased impact from a larger population?

- concern that the driving factors for these proposals are central government targets (probably driven by politicians striving to meet any manifesto “promises” they have made in order to get elected), money and profits in that the developers are motivated by profit and the University of Kent which has openly stated that they have sold the land in order to address it’s financial difficulties. None of these things are genuinely in the best interests of local communities or the environment.

Whilst this list and comments are not exhaustive and there are likely many other specific things we would wish to comment on if we had the time to, we feel strongly that we want and need to express our concerns and to object to do what ever we can to protect our local area and it’s unique and irreplaceable nature.

With that in mind, we urge you to note and support our objections.

Yours faithfully

Jane and Nigel True

Sent from my iPad